

U.S. Application No. 09/455,363

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**REMARKS**

DEC 12 2006

The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 26-37 are now pending, including new claims 2-37.

The Applicants submitted a certified copy of JP 10-347235 on November 23, 2003. The Examiner has not yet acknowledged receipt of the priority document. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner acknowledge the priority document in the next Patent Office communication.

Claims 26-27 and 29-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dobbins et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,485,455 (Dobbins) in view of Jain et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,311,218 (Jain) and Inoue et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,891,819 (Inoue). Claims 28 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dobbins, Jain and Inoue, and further in view of Townsend et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,661,719 (Townsend). The Applicants traverse as follows.

The Office Action recognizes that both Dobbins and Jain do not disclose that when the user is not authenticated, the packet is not transferred. The Office Action cites Inoue as to this feature, but the Applicants contend that although Inoue appears to disclose that the mobile computer 2 is inhibited from sending a message when authentication fails, col. 12, lines 61-63 of the patent disclose that a message is inhibited from being sent on the mobile computer side, but not that the side of the home agent 5 is inhibited from receiving a message from the mobile computer 2. That is, Inoue does not teach that the home agent is prevented from receiving a message from the mobile computer.

U.S. Application No. 09/455,363

In contrast, according to the claimed invention, when user authentication fails, a packet sent from the source terminal is inhibited from being transferred via a second port. Inoue teaches no such inhibition.

Even if Inoue were to be arranged according to the claimed invention so as not to transfer a packet from the home agent 5 because a communication is required between the mobile computer 2 and the home agent 5, the arrangement would frustrate Inoue's stated purpose of reducing the load caused by the repeated unsuccessful attempts to authenticate transmitted from the mobile computer 2 to the home agent 5. Thus, there is no suggestion to modify Inoue in order to be combined with Dobbins and Jain in order to reach the claimed invention.

Each of the new dependent claims has separate patentability. The Applicants refer the Examiner to the present specification on pages 29-30 for examples of support for these claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

To the extent necessary, the Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to

U.S. Application No. 09/455,363

the deposit account of Mattingly, Stanger, Malur & Brundidge, P.C., Deposit Account
No. 50-1417 (referencing attorney docket no. ASA-838).

Respectfully submitted,
MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Daniel J. Stanger", is written over a horizontal line.

Daniel J. Stanger
Registration No. 32,846

DJS/sdb
(703) 684-1120